



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/199,723	11/25/1998	GRAHAM W. GLASS	019778.0175	4018

7590 01/23/2002

BAKER & BOTTS  
2001 ROSS AVENUE  
DALLAS, TX 752012980

EXAMINER

FOURSON, GARY SCOTT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.G.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/199,723

Applicant(s)

GLASS, GRAHAM W.

Examiner

Gary S. Fourson

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 1 recites the limitation “the forwarder agent” in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Examiner will interpret the limitation to be referring to the forwarder object introduced in line 6 for initial examination purposes only, and appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Black et al. (US 5,325,524).**

With respect to claim 1, Black et al. teaches a system for locating mobile objects in a computer system. Black illustrates and provides detailed explanation for moving a first object [mobile objects, col. 2, e.g. object A.sub.2] from a current position [storesite, e.g. remote node 2] to a new position [“a second remote node” or “a third remote node,” col. 5 lines 47-50] in a computer network, creating a forwarder object at the current position [second and third remote nodes contain TADs in the LII], placing information with respect to the new position at the forwarder object [TADs contain a forwarding address]. An LPC or RPC is sent from an invoking object [col. 5 lines 1-29; Fig.3 step 1] to “Node in Best Available TAD” [Fig 3 step 6]. At the remote node or “Node in Best Available TAD” shown in Figure 4, the RPC message is

Art Unit: 2151

forwarded to another remote node by the LII according to the TAD object information indicating the forwarding address. Possibility 3 (7c) shows the path where the intended recipient [first object] receives and processes the request.

As to **claim 5**, the forwarder is destroyed after routing the message to the first object [Through TAD updating, old TADs will be destroyed. See column 6 lines 36-63].

As to **claim 6**, wherein the current position and the new position are host address and port numbers [Column 1 lines 34-55 note that RPC requests contain information such as server address. Various port numbers are known to designate specific purposes such as requesting information or function execution.].

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 2-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al. (US 5,325,524).**

As to **claims 2-4**, Black teaches creating a reply message with information with respect to the new position [results returned with the best available TAD for future requests, col. 8 lines 17-20; see Fig. 4 step 15]. However, Black is silent on sending the reply message directly to the second object.

Black notes the results are returned, and, since the RPC may have to be forwarded through multiple nodes or hops as noted in col. 5 lines 47-50, it would be obvious to conclude that the results are returned directly. As to sending a subsequent message created at the second object to the first object at the new position, wherein the subsequent message is sent directly to the first object, future request messages would use the updated TAD to directly contact the desired object and receive the desired results as shown in path 3 of Fig. 3 [step 7c].

As to **claim 7**, Black is silent on the lifespan of the TAD objects in the IIL layer. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2151

made that the forwarder object [TAD] would only be required as long as the first object exists, because the forwarder object would obviously not be required after the deletion of the intended recipient object.

***Pertinent Prior Art***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. O'Farrell et al. (US 5,655,101) teaches a system for accessing remote data objects, wherein a variable pointing to a home processor for a particular data object is stored in all of the remote processors at the same (parallel) memory location as that of the particular data object.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Gary Fourson at telephone number (703) 305-4392 or E-mail at the address [gary.fourson@uspto.gov](mailto:gary.fourson@uspto.gov).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

The fax numbers for Official (703-746-7239), to be intended for entry into the application, Non-Official/Draft (703-746-7240), or After-final (703-746-7238) communications may be utilized for expedited transactions.

gsf

January 17, 2002

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**